CCRB INVESTIGATIVE RECOMMENDATION

Investigator:		Team:	CCRB Case #:	☑ Force	☐ Discourt.	☐ U.S.
Alex Starace		Team # 1	201013768	☐ Abuse	O.L.	☐ Injury
Incident Date(s)		Location of Incident:		Precinct:	18 Mo. SOL	EO SOL
Monday, 10/04/2010 11:00 PM		Myrtle Avenue and Tompkins Avenue		79	4/4/2012	4/4/2012
Date/Time CV Reported		CV Reported At:	How CV Reported:	Date/Time	Received at CCF	RB
Mon, 10/04/2010 10:50 PM		IAB	Phone	Thu, 10/07	7/2010 1:18 PM	
Complainant/Victim	Туре	Home Addre	ess			
Witness(es)		Home Addre	ess			
Subject Officer(s)	Shield	TaxID	Command			
Subject Officer(s) 1. POM Alexander Bobo	Shield 06146	TaxID 947985	Command PBBN			
		947985				
1. POM Alexander Bobo	06146	947985 o Tax No	PBBN			
1. POM Alexander Bobo Witness Officer(s)	06146 Shield N	947985 o Tax No 932190	PBBN Cmd Name	Inve	estigator Recon	nmendation

Synopsis

On October 4, 2010, an unidentified male called IAB to file a complaint. A spin-off was generated and sent to the CCRB on October 7, 2010.

On October 4, 2010, the unidentified caller stated that another unidentified individual, later identified as § 87(2)(b) was pepper sprayed that evening by an unidentified officer at the intersection of Myrtle Avenue and Tompkins Avenue in Brooklyn. Upon speaking to §87(2)(b) who was identified via an ACR that was created in conjunction with the incident, §87(2)(b) stated that the officer who pepper sprayed him was named "Bebo," whom the undersigned has identified as PO Alexander Bobo of Patrol Borough Brooklyn North based on the fact that PO Bobo arrested someone named at the same time and location that §87(2)(b) was arrested, and that stated that the subject officer arrested himself and another individual at the time and location in question. Therefore, Allegation A is pleaded against PO Bobo. Sgt. Alan Myrthil of Brooklyn North IRT arrived at the location to verify the arrest. He is listed as a witness officer. Attempts were made to contact the original complainant, however, the phone number used to file the complaint was associated with a pre-paid cellphone that, when the case was received by the CCRB, was no longer functioning. According to Cellco Partnership, because the phone was pre-paid, the number had never been connected with any named subscriber. Without any more information, other than a phone number and gender, the undersigned could not contact the original complainant. He therefore remains unidentified. On January 10, 2011, \$87(2)(b) spoke with the undersigned via telephone and agreed to appear at the CCRB on January 21, 2011. He did not do so. A missed appointment letter was sent the same day and §87(2)(b) was contacted again via telephone on January 24, 2011. He again agreed to appear at the CCRB, this time on January 31, 2011. He did not do so, nor did he call to explain his absence. According to the NYC DOC website, \$87(2)(b) is not currently incarcerated. \$87(2)(9) Team: _____ Investigator: Signature Print Date Supervisor: Title/Signature Print Date

> Page 2 CCRB Case # 201013768

Reviewer:			
	Title/Signature	Print	Date
Reviewer:			
	Title/Signature	Print	Date